1:Sanders Z-5,4 (1952-1959) 1962 EH1 Greece EH1

178 241 main crop because the peasant can harvest them before the great heat of summer descends and the countryside lies parched and torpid under the blazing sun.

Land Reform (Thessaly)

423 Attica was selected as the best illustration of land ownership in Greece, but Thessaly, with the richest land in Greece, almost selects itself to illustrate modern Greek land reform.[12] The size of the farm holding in Thessaly [241] averages just over eleven acres, which is the highest of any province: the figure is less than ten acres in Macedonia, Thrace, and Central Greece; just over five acres in Epirus and the Peloponnesos; and less than five acres on the islands. No wonder that now and then I encountered what can best be termed "land-hungry peasants," particularly where they thought that the government, through its program of land redistribution, was in a position to turn over to them at a reasonable figure the fields of some estate not yet fully reduced to the proper size set by the land-reform law.

This was the case in 1953 in Thomai, a village not far from Larissa, the capital city of Thessaly. I was driving the director of agriculture in Larissa out on his inspection trip through the neighboring area where a severe rainstorm had damaged the nearly ripe wheat. The road, stretching for [177] miles between grain fields, was headed in the direction of Trikkala and passed the Larissa Forest Nursery, whose sign linked it with the Marshall [243] Plan. Farther on, in recently harvested grain fields, a few gleaners were bending over the golden stubble in the hot sun, gathering their winter's bread supply like Ruth who gleaned in the fields of Boaz. In rich Thessaly, [735] there are few gleaners now, but the unwritten law permitting gleaning still exists for those poor villagers who need it.

● [671] During the drive the discussion centered about the problem of land reform. The director was reluctant to visit Thomai because he had not yet received any final instructions from Athens to help him answer the questions he knew the villagers would ask about some promised increase in their land. The Land Reform Law of 1917 had boldly attacked the problem of the big estates, and its gradual application had eliminated tenancy throughout most of Greece by 1930. Around 1922 the influx of refugees, with their desperate need for land, speeded up the redistribution. This law still permitted certain classes of landlords to hold up to 500 acres although requiring them to dispose of acreages above that amount. As the result of further government action in 1952, the archbishop of the national church had agreed to the sale of the monastery estates, which accounted for a little more than one fourth of the 1.5 million acres to be turned over to private proprietors in this new redistribution program. Another type of landlord living in Larissa had formerly owned about half of the rich Thessaly plain; he had given up most of the land, keeping the 500-acre maximum holding.

423 427 [671] [792]

1:Sanders Z-5,4 (1952-1959) 1962 EH1 Greece EH1

governmental structure which tied together these separated local governments into any larger whole. Thus, as Greece moved toward modern nationhood, the type of local government which had existed under the Ottoman Empire began to wither.

One Athenian professor said to me that after ten years of revolution (1821–1830) the people wanted a king who could end anarchy and bring order. They had to accept a centralized government and put up with laws not natural to the country but which were necessary if Greece were to appear "civilized" enough to get loans from abroad. "We still need a legal system agreeing better with our country," he concluded. This is one reason, he thinks, why the peasant tries to get around the laws; he does not look upon them as his laws, as Greek laws.

During the first forty years of this century, the greatest changes in community life occurred under Venizelos in 1912 and under Metaxas in 1935. Venizelos, for instance, refashioned the old demes, or local units consisting of several villages, and made each village a unit responsible for supporting many local services under a community council and president. The deme still had the taxing, police, and judicial powers. The central government attempted to supply teachers for communities, a step which meant much less local autonomy but which was essential if Greece were to have a uniform system of education. Many other activities which local governmental bodies had handled up to this time had to be approved by the nomarch (administrator of the nomos) and ministry. Even the Constitution of 1927, though leaving to local government matters managed directly by the citizens, left the definition of "local matters" so vague that the demes and communes were at the mercy of the legislators and ministries who, by law and decree, could "outline their powers, procedures, and revenues."[4]

Metaxas, after abrogating the Constitution of 1927, imposed on the total Greek population "modern" methods of hygiene, childrearing, and education. He even attempted to introduce early weaning and the use of bottles. In community affairs, local elections were abolished and local officials could be dismissed and replaced by the Minister of the Interior.

Today, according to one authority:

> The local government units in Greece are demes and communes. There are 217 demes and 5,746 communes. Demes, under the 1912 law, were those units with 10,000 or more population; but recent amendments allowed so many exceptions that there are now 144 below this minimum standard. Communes are supposed to have 300 or more people and an elementary school; but this standard was also relaxed so that now there are many below this figure. As a matter of fact, half of the communes today have less than five hundred inhabitants.[5]

Since such small population centers cannot support all of the expected services, some kind of amalgamation of units is thought desirable. But how

2: Friedl E-5 (1955-1959) 463 EH1 Greece EH1
Vasilika

4

The Family: Dowry and Inheritance; Formal Structure[1]

182 428 583 THE DOWRY AND INHERITANCE SYSTEM in Vasilika is primarily a mechanism by which property is transferred from one generation to the next. It is this kind of mechanism, but it is also more. By reason of the context of values in which they operate and because of their specific characteristics, dowry and inheritance patterns as they function in Vasilika have ramifications not only for the Boeotian countryside but also for Greece as a whole.

Inheritance by Sons

428 583 Both the Greek laws of inheritance and village custom require that property be divided equally among all the children, sons and daughters alike. Some receive their shares through inheritance or by gifts while the parents are [671] still alive, but the daughters of a family are entitled to their share at marriage in [594] the form of a dowry. Since, from the standpoint of the villagers, a man's most compelling obligation is to arrange for the successful marriage of his daughters, and since no girl in Vasilika can normally expect to marry without at least a token dowry, the girls have first lien on the family's property. For most of [423] Vasilika's families, land holdings are the most valuable assets, and dowries are, therefore, calculated ordinarily as a transfer of a share of the land from parents to a daughter and through her to the jurisdiction of her husband. However, if a family's land holdings are such that it is obvious that by giving daughters their

[1] Portions of this chapter were presented as a paper at a conference on Rural Peoples of the Mediterranean held at Burg Wartenstein in July 1959, and will appear in *Mediterranean Countrymen*, edited by Julian Pitt-Rivers, Mouton and Co., The Hague, scheduled for publication in 1962.

2:Friedl E-5 (1955-1959)1963 EH1 Greece EH1
Vasilika

are said to have neither brains nor self-control. Parents with marriageable children were, therefore, in 1961, contemplating the division of their estates into fewer portions than their parents had done before them.

As his children are growing up, a farmer calculates approximately what he must give his daughter or daughters for dowries and how much will be left for each of his sons to share. If it is fairly obvious that the share left for the sons will be insufficient to support each of them, the farmer tries to make some other provision for one or more of the boys. Any boy who shows promise as a student is encouraged to continue his schooling beyond the compulsory sixth-grade elementary school in the village. Education is so highly prized that sometimes even an only son who might inherit an adequate farm is allowed to continue his education if he shows ability in academic subjects. The next step after elementary school most commonly chosen by the villagers is the six-year classical or humanistic gymnasium which serves as a necessary base for any civil service or white-collar post, and also for further study in the university or in specialized advanced technical schools. Although there are some private gymnasia, most of the farmers of Vasilika have sent their sons to the virtually free public institutions (Antonakaki 1955:39). These are in the provincial towns or in Athens, so that although there is little tuition charge, the farmer must pay for his son's board and room, for his school supplies, and for adequate clothing. Whenever possible, children are boarded with an aunt or uncle who lives in the town, but even under these conditions, farmers pay a fee to the relatives to cover the cost of their children's care. Sometimes, to keep food costs down, a mother prepares a basket of bread, cheese, and perhaps a vegetable stew for her son, places it in the bus bound for the town in which the boy goes to school, and the boy picks up the basket at the bus depot.

Whatever the particular arrangement, schooling involves an expenditure of current income, and the farmers consider that the cost of educating a son is about equivalent to a major portion of his share of the inheritance. The Greek Civil Code makes a specific provision for this view by declaring that educational expenses beyond those normally to be expected from the economic position of the family may be counted as part of the inheritance (Section 1895). In Vasilika it is assumed that a gymnasium-educated young man will spend the rest of his life living in some town, and that he will receive only a token share of the land after his father's death or at the time of the division of the estate. His parents, brothers, and sisters remaining in the villages as farmers gain in social stature and in potential actual advantage from his residence in town in a prestige-giving occupation. Both the legal code and village custom, then, involve the recognition that when farmers or shepherds undertake to educate their sons beyond the village school, they are striving for an improved status position in the nation as a whole, and that if sons succeed in the new prestige-giving occupation, they are the agents of upward social mobility for the family. Among Vasilika's land-owning farmers, an educated son gives the village the added advantage of a larger amount of land to divide among the remaining children. For farmers and shepherds who have very small land holdings or none at all, the

2:Friedl E-5 (1955-1959)1963 EH1 Greece EH1
Vasilika

mately the standard she had at home? How many brothers does the groom have who are also going to be farmers and who will, therefore, have to share the house itself, or for whom some housing provision must eventually be made? Because personal qualities of the prospective groom will influence the success with which he manages his own and his dower properties, a father asks whether the groom has a reputation for industriousness. Is there any danger that the groom will "eat" the dowry properties, as the villagers phrase a propensity for using capital resources for current needs or for luxuries? Are the groom's father and brothers sober men who will conserve property and work to get the best income from it?

In short, the bride's father wants to assure, insofar as he is able, the future well-being of his daughter and of her children. He also wants the emotional satisfaction of having been successful at making a good arrangement for her. One village father pointed to a field we were passing and explained that he had given it to his daughter as part of her *prika* (dowry), so that all the cotton from the field was for his grandson. He then went on to say that he had married his daughter well and said of his three-year-old grandson, "Who knows, one day he might become a lawyer or a doctor. He has a brain, the little one." The implication was that he, the farmer, had contributed to whatever the final destiny of his grandson might be by having supplied such good fields for his daughter's dowry.

A girl's parents also want assurance that she will live in a congenial household. They hope that the new mother-in-law and the groom's sisters will accept the girl with good grace and that she will be decently treated. A man's wife and daughter will always remind him of the resources the family has already expended on the trousseau and the skill with which they were woven. From the women's point of view, these are important parts of the cost, and they want a girl to go to a family which will appreciate both the quantity and the fine workmanship of the *rukha.* Some friction between a girl and her mother-in-law and sisters-in-law is accepted in Vasilika as part of the condition of marriage to a farmer. The severity of friction is mitigated, however, by the independent dignity a girl acquires by having brought her husband a dowry and by the pride her husband's family takes in their own skill at having helped arrange a good marriage for their son.

The groom's interest, on the other hand, is to supplement his patrimony with as much land and cash as he can get from his wife's dowry. After their marriage, the husband and wife will have jurisdiction over her dowry properties. Unless the marriage contract states otherwise, and it rarely does in marriages between a farmer and a village girl, the husband has the right to the management and control of movable and personal property that he received with his wife and the management of the real estate given as part of the dowry. The alienation of movable dower property requires only the informal consent of his wife, while the alienation of real estate requires a formal notarized consent statement from his wife and the permission of the court (Civil Code Sections 1416 and 1417). (The groom's father, therefore, is interested only from the standpoint of the general welfare of his son. He himself will have no direct control over his daughter-in-law's land or money.)

2:Friedl E-5 (1955-1959)/963 EH1 Greece EH1
Vasilika

lives in his wife's village and has married a girl from his own settlement and, therefore, has land near the groom's village. A farmer husband may even be willing to consider the sale of the land in his wife's village to make a good purchase nearer home. Neither of these possibilities may come to fruition for years, so that they may remain subjects for long-term discussion between a man and his father- and brothers-in-law. To summarize the situation, land given as one part of the dowry and village exogamy have the consequence of stimulating land exchanges and sales in the Boeotian countryside, of stimulating the visits of men among the villages in the region with a consequent exchange of views and ideas, and of providing an economic focus for maintaining some kind of relationships between affinal relatives, that is relatives by marriage. The system of transferring land as dowry has the effect also of permitting a man to utilize his wife's property throughout his married life instead of having to wait to do so until after his wife's father's death.

The actions of the villagers and the tone in which they discuss these questions suggest that although there is some sentiment attached to the land inherited from a father and to the land that were parts of a mother's dowry, the symbolic value of particular parcels of land as a link between generations does not usually take precedence over the economic value of the land as an income and food producer.

We have still to consider the question of the ultimate disposition of dower properties in marriages between farmers. The Greek Civil Code states that dower property must be accounted for separately from that owned or eventually inherited by the husband, and as we have seen, stipulates that the consent of the wife is required before dower property can be sold or exchanged. If there is a divorce, the wife is entitled to the return of the dower property or of its equivalent. In the house of the groom's father, the newly married couple is given a room in which they and, later, their children sleep. Here the bride's trousseau gives the room a personal touch. Both the young people work on the farm holdings of the groom's father along with his father, mother, and brothers, and unmarried sisters. They also work on the young wife's dower lands. The income from these may be pooled with that from the paternal holdings but need not be. The young husband's father has jurisdiction over the ordinary living expenses of the entire household and distributes the cash needed for purchases of clothing, food, and household equipment. During the lifetime of his father, the cash portion of the dowry may be invested by the son in additional land or in some other capital equipment such as a diesel pump. Under no circumstances do the villagers consider it proper to sell dower lands or to use dower funds for ordinary living expenses. Only the need for money for a very serious illness or for some other emergency is felt to justify such action. In whatever form, the dowry is considered capital which may be invested or saved to add to the estate available for the newly married couple's children.

After the death of the husband's father, the young man continues to live with his brothers, most of whom are likely to be married by now, until they decide to separate and divide the patrimony. This now consists of the property their father inherited from his father's patrimony, the dower property of their

2: Friedl E-5 (1955-1959) 943 EH1 Greece EH1
Vasilika

596 ing composition of the households is a deceptive base for understanding the
594 principles of organization of households in the village. The existent situation is
178 one in which elementary family households predominate, but the mental construct which influences the formation of new households does not seem to have changed from the old expectation that several married farming brothers will live together. It remains as a latent principle, available for implementation whenever the circumstances warrant it.

Consequences of the Dowry System

428 The discussion of the dowry as a mechanism of inheritance for children
583 of farmers who remain farmers may now be summarized. The dowry is part of
182 a system in which children receive property through the parents of both their fathers and their mothers. Property from two sources merges in each generation
[594] and is redistributed in the next generation. Although patrilineally inherited lands (those passed from a father to his sons in each generation) have some continuity in space and have some continuity of ownership in the male line, such lands always constitute only one part of the total holdings of any particular elementary family. Therefore, in Vasilika and its vicinity, the pattern of land and money circulation through inheritance has two facets: one portion that is patrilineally inherited straight down the line of males; a second, distributed at marriage, that eventually circulates among unrelated elementary families. The system
[421] cannot be described as one in which women inherit from women, in spite of the legal residual control of a woman over her dower properties, because brothers have equal rights with their sisters to their mother's dower lands. In Vasilika, at least, there is neither an explicit nor an implicit pattern of giving daughters only dower property and sons only patrilineally inherited lands.

602 The combination of practices including the function of the dowry as
428 inheritance, land as a major form of property, and village exogamy have some
425 further consequences for the relation of property to groups of kinsmen in the Boeotian countryside. In spite of patrilocal residence and some patrilineally in-
[613] herited land, the descendants of a male line are not associated with any particular landed estates. Since no man owns or farms exactly the same holdings as his father farmed before him, nor the same holdings his brothers have, and since he himself will expect to work different lands in different communities even in the course of his own adult life, the permanent association of certain estates with
[583] certain lineages is obstructed (Friedl 1959b). Moreover, since dowries move
[582] down the generations and not across to a man of one's own generation who might use the property to marry off one of his daughters, there is no economic
[671] advantage to brother-and-sister exchange marriages. This situation is congruent
[795] with both the Greek Orthodox Church's and the Civil Code's (Section 1357) prohibitions on marriages between sisters and brothers-in-law and between cousins to the third degree. This rule, as well as the bilateral reckoning of kin
[611] in Greece (Section 1356), prevents the transfer of property at marriage from resulting in either a series of equal exchanges between two sets of kin groups

2:Friedl E-5 (1955-1959)/963 EH1 Greece EH1
Vasilika

management, they recognized the work of their women as contributing labor value, but in the context of the dowry, they did not see the situation this way.

The villagers act and talk as if they felt that it is the obligation of men to care for women, and that the obligation is largely fulfilled by the provision of a dowry for a daughter. The provision of the dowry is thus, in a sense, an outward manifestation of masculinity. By village custom, when a father dies or is incapacitated, a girl's brothers are considered responsible for marrying her off, and they are usually expected to fulfill this obligation before they themselves marry. This point of view does not correspond with the legal requirements. In the Civil Code (Section 1496) the mother is responsible for furnishing dowries for her daughters in the event of her husband's death or incapacity. The village attitude, however, I believe, is based partly on the feeling that most women are not capable of managing their estates and on the congruent custom of appointing male guardians to manage for them until their sons are grown, but more importantly on the basic notion that the provision of dowries is a male prerogative.

The emotional overtones accompanying the dowry system may be understood as a possible shift of emphasis from one kind of expression of male honor to another. Anthropologists who have worked in Greek Cypriot villages and in shepherd communities[3] report that the males in these settlements, almost all equally poor, based their sense of manly prestige not on wealth, but on the degree of honor they achieved by the protection of the chastity of their women. It would seem as if, in Boeotia, male honor depends not only on male protection of the chastity of women but also more explicitly and obviously on the provision by the men of adequate dowries for their women. The sense of satisfaction a man gets from dowering a daughter becomes more intense and compelling because the action is also an expression of his masculinity.

The shift of emphasis can be demonstrated in the village. Among the shepherds and landless or land-poor families in the village, girls marry earlier, with small dowries and trousseaus, and acquire correspondingly less prosperous husbands. The fathers and brothers involved, and the other villagers, comment on these unions by saying that early marriages are essential because otherwise the girls might run wild and disgrace the family. In other words, then, when economic means are limited, men can maintain their honor and self-respect only by protecting their women, and this becomes the paramount concern. The villagers seem to recognize that when there is no hope for even the modest degree of economic security and material well-being that the dowries of Vasilika's landowning farmers can provide, there is less impetus for the girl herself to remain virtuous or for her prospective suitors to respect her situation without the added emphasis on physical retaliation by her menfolk. However, flamboyant behavior and clandestine affairs could destroy the hope of a decent marriage for a girl whose father can provide a reasonable dowry. Or such actions might require an exorbitant dowry to overcome the effects of her bad reputation. For these girls, the rewards of waiting are great enough for them to be willing to postpone both

[3] John Peristiany and John Campbell, respectively.

are concerned. Greek parents are agreed that the principal thing to teach their children is to be honest and to tell the truth; but this, of course, means to be honest in their dealings with their parents and other relatives and all the friends of these, and with people who value them and trust them as persons. Honesty in abstraction is not a virtue, and may even be branded as foolishness. Loyalty also is never to something abstract, like the government, which is equated with impersonal law. Loyalty is to the Greek nation, to Greece, the mother of the people, to personified freedom, but not to "the Greeks" who are unknown. Profiteering and dealings on the black market were not considered bad, because they circumvented only impersonal law and showed disloyalty only to the government and to the unknown Greeks; actually they were good in terms of the family, to whom an individual owes his loyalty.

Responsibility is not social responsibility but family responsibility, or it might be extended to friends and to the village. With loyalty evoked only in personal relations, it follows that Greeks cannot be impartial in awarding jobs or distributing goods. To take care of one's own first, irrespective of merit or of an order of priority, is one's duty; it means fulfilling one's role. Yet impartiality, just because it is so difficult to maintain in the face of strong forces and temptations to "bend", and devotion to an abstract ideal of honesty, just because it is saintly, are highly admired in Greece—though perhaps not by the immediate relatives of the impartial man. Such people inspire what amounts to worship.

Co-operation in this framework is actually mutual aid, one person helping the other, or it is loyalty to the leader who initiates a co-operative undertaking, with men contributing their work for his sake, and women bringing gifts to him, which can be used incidentally for the undertaking.

Obedience is very important and is taught to a child almost from birth; but again, this is obedience within a structured whole, to the parents, older siblings, and to people who stand in this relationship; that is, to friends of the parents or of older relatives, or appropriately introduced older people. Authority comes only from place in this structured whole, and obedience is only to people. Government is not personal, and the law is external to the organic, structured whole. It is not the voice of Greece. There is therefore no obligation to obey the law; the guide to conduct here is expediency, and the ability to circumvent. Before the political centralization, there was obedience and lasting loyalty to the schoolteacher. Now he represents only the interfering authority of the government, and it is an accepted thing that the students should try to circumvent his authority in every way they can, playing tricks on him and otherwise treating him as an enemy, since he is outside of the web of their loyalties.